

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 11-17 are new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawing, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 to address the Examiner's rejections. Claims 8-9 are amended accordingly. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachse (U.S. Pat. No. 6,985,901) in view of Bush (U.S. Pat. No. 6,754,664). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As presented in the response to the first Office action filed on October 23, 2007, Sachse at best discloses using a predetermined interval to perform a polling. Sachse fails to teach or suggest "determining a first set of devices to be polled from the managed devices, wherein the first set of devices at least comprises an operation device set" of claim 1.

Claim 1 is directed to, among other things, an operation device set to be polled. By determining a first set of devices to be polled from the managed devices, wherein the first set of devices at least comprises an operation set, the operation device set to which a user pays attention has a high priority for utilizing limited network resources to perform polling. Subsequently, under the circumstances of network congestion, the polling rate of the operation device set is greater than that of the other devices, thus limited network resources can be fully utilized. Applicant submits that Bush fails to teach or suggest the above limitations.

In view of foregoing, Applicant submits that the claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 8-9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has rewritten claim 8 as independent claim 11 including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has added new claim 16, which depends from claim 11 and includes all the limitations of claim 9. Therefore, claims 11 and 16 should be in condition for allowance now.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 11-17 are new. As presented above, claim 11 is claim 8 rewritten in independent form and should be in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that claims 12-17, which directly or indirectly depend from 11 and include the limitations of claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 respectively, should also be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 7, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm